



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,969	07/03/2001	Ramesh Lhila	6001-44-1	9960

7590 10/15/2004  
McCormick, Paulding & Huber  
City Place II  
185 Asylum Street  
Hartford, CT 06103-3402

EXAMINER

VO, HAI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

DATE MAILED: 10/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/898,969

Applicant(s)

LHILA, RAMESH

Examiner

Hai Vo

Art Unit

1771

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 30 September 2004. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the use of a primer layer in Everaerts appears to be optional, thus rendering the Everaerts invention operable without a primer. The examiner disagrees. The use of a primer layer in Everaerts may be optional but it is not completely excluded from the Everaerts invention. Everaerts discloses the presence of the primer layer between the acrylic foam core and the PSA layer (column 10, lines 30-31 and table 9). Everaerts does not teach the composition of the primer layer. Ragland teaches the inclusion of a urethane primer layer between the silicone foam and the acrylic PSA layer. Therefore, in view of Ragland, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the primer layer between the acrylic foam core and the PSA layer of the Everaerts invention motivated by the desire to promote adhesion between the acrylic foam core and PSA layer. Applicant argues that the urethane primer disclosed by De Santis is not a silane modified elastomer solution because urethanes and silanes are two very different compounds. Therefore there can be no suggestion or motivation to combine DeSantis with Everaerts to arrive at the invention as recited in Applicant's claim 1. The examiner disagrees. Turning to example 2 of De Santis, the polyurethane composition was prepared by a composition that among other things includes gamma-mercaptopropyl trimethoxy silane. It is not understood to conclude that the urethane primer is not a silane modified elastomer solution.



TERREL MORRIS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700